UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/578,600	03/31/2008	James M. Brugger	T4342-14501US02	9019		
	7590 08/13/201 CKBRIDGE PC	I EXAMINER				
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE SUITE 500		DEAK, LESLIE R				
MCLEAN, VA	22102-3833		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3761			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			08/13/2010	ELECTRONIC		

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocketing@milesstockbridge.com sstiles@milesstockbridge.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/578,600	BRUGGER ET AL.	
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LESLIE R. DEAK	3761	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>LESLIE R. DEAK</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Mark Catan</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 9 August 2010	Time:		
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	ant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 1-18			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since the	substance
/Leslie R. Deak/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3761	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if app	propriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner made a telephone restriction requirement between the pinching valve of claims 1-2 (embodiment shown in FIGS 5A, 5B), the pinching valve of claims 3-4 and 12-15 (embodiment shown in FIG 7), and claims 5-11, drawn to a valving apparatus with a controller that does not require any of the pinching action of the other embodiments. Examiner further indicated claims 1-2 to be allowable over the prior art since the prior art fails to disclose or suggest a ring-shaped valve as claimed by Applicant with a pivoting actuator that pinches flow paths to change flow direction, along with the other steps and limitations of the claims. Applicant's representative indicated election of claims 1-2 without travers and a desire to add claims drawn to the embodiment of claim 1. Examiner agreed to review claims submitted in a preliminary amendment and is awaiting such an amendment before acting on the case.